

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-26 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-16 and 18-26 are rejected under 35 USC §103.

The final Office Action dated Jan. 25, 2008 indicates that claims 1-6, 9 and 11-14 are unpatentable over Webb US 2004/0257225 in view of Jorgenson US 2003/0028388; claims 7-8 are unpatentable over Webb in view of Jorgenson and Easley U.S. Patent No. 7,098,784; and the remaining claims are unpatentable over Webb in view of others. These rejections have been rendered moot by the amendments above.

Claims 1-6 and 9-26 have been cancelled.

Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form to recite that a container is classified or scored to “assess the level of threat presented as new data about threat patterns and relationships are discovered.” Support for this feature can be found in paragraph 44 of the specification. The documents made of record do not teach or suggest this feature. The office action cites cols. 4 and 7 of Easley, and alleges that Easley shows threat detectors and sensors for monitoring shipping containers. An alarm is triggered if a sensor exceeds a threshold. However, Easley doesn’t teach or suggest processing different events to determine whether a threat is serious. Easley determines whether a single event occurs. Therefore, amended claim 7 and its dependent claim 8 (which has been amended to depend properly from claim 7) should be allowed over the documents made of record.

Claim 27 is new. New claim 27 recites a system including a CSU that reports on status of a container during shipment from an origination point to a destination. Frequency of the reporting is a function of the geographic location of the container. Support for this feature can be found in paragraphs 18 and 30 of the specification.

For instance, the reporting frequency can be reduced if the threat is low (for instance, if the container is at sea on a ship). In contrast, the frequency can be increased if the threat is high (for instance, if the container is parked in a rail yard).

This feature allows battery power of the CSU to be reduced. Reducing battery power, in turn, allows smaller, lighter batteries to be used by the CSU, which reduces the weight of the CSU. Reduced weight, in turn, can reduce the cost of shipping, especially via aircraft.

This feature is not taught or suggested by the documents made of record. Therefore, new claim 27 should be allowed over the documents made of record.

Claim 28, which depends from claim 27, is also new. New claim 28 recites a CSU bridge for communicating with the CSU. Support for this feature can be found at paragraphs 23 and 31 of the specification.

The CSU bridge enables additional monitoring capability and allows data transmission to occur using vehicle power supply rather than using the CSU's scarce battery power. Thus, use of the CSU bridge allows battery power to be reduced even further.

This feature is not taught or suggested by the documents made of record. Therefore, new claim 28 should be allowed over the documents made of record.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/
Hugh P. Gortler
Reg. No. 33,890
(949) 454-0898

Date: May 27, 2008